

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Michael G. Naessens,

Plaintiff(s),

V.

Bank of America, N.A.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:25-cv-01079-RFB-NJK

Order

[Docket Nos. 69, 70]

Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. Docket No. 70; *see also* Docket No. 69 (sealed version).¹ Plaintiff filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 75.² Defendant filed a reply. Docket No. 81. Having considered the governing standards, *see, e.g., Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581-84 (D. Nev. 2013), the Court finds that a stay of discovery is warranted.³ Accordingly, the motion to stay discovery is **GRANTED**. If resolution of the underlying motion to dismiss does not result in termination of this action, the parties must confer and file an amended joint discovery plan within 21 days of the issuance of that order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 7, 2025

Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The motion to dismiss has been briefed. Docket Nos. 40, 42, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 59, 60.

² The Court liberally construes the filings of *pro se* litigants. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).

³ Conducting the preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the assigned district judge will decide the underlying motion and may have a different view of the merits. *See Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 603 (D. Nev. 2011). The undersigned’s “preliminary peek” at the merits of the motion for judgment on the pleadings is not intended to prejudice its outcome. *See id.* The undersigned carefully reviewed the arguments presented in the underlying motion and related briefing, but will not provide discussion of the merits herein.